

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

10-1-2004

Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for the Faculty Handbook

Jean-Paul Carton
Georgia Southern University

Faculty Welfare Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Carton, Jean-Paul and Faculty Welfare Committee, "Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for the Faculty Handbook" (2004). *Faculty Senate Index*. 513.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/513>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 10/19/2004

Not Approved by the Senate:

Approved by the President:

Not Approved by the President:

Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for the Faculty Handbook

Submitted by: Jean-Paul Carton/Faculty Welfare Committee

10/1/2004

Motion:

The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends keeping the first paragraph of 216.07 as it currently is in the Faculty Handbook and deleting the second paragraph of 216.07.

Rationale:

This proposed workload statement was submitted to the SEC in Spring 2004 by the office of the Provost. The SEC chair asked the FWC to review it and make a recommendation. At the April 22 meeting the Faculty Senate voted to delay consideration of this statement until after the Faculty Roles and Rewards report has been submitted and considered by the faculty.

Senate Response:

To Dr. Grube for his approval: I am pleased to report that the Senate recommends approval of the motion below presented by the Faculty Welfare Committee at the October 19, 2004, Faculty Senate meeting.

Motion: The Faculty Welfare Committee recommends keeping the first paragraph of 216.07 as it currently is in the Faculty Handbook and deleting the second paragraph of 216.07.

Rationale: This proposed workload statement was submitted to the SEC in Spring 2004 by the office of the Provost. The SEC chair asked the FWC to review it and make a recommendation.

At the April 22 meeting the Faculty Senate voted to delay consideration of this statement until after the Faculty Roles and Rewards report has been submitted and considered by the faculty.

216.07 Teaching Load (Current first paragraph – second is moot) The standard teaching load for full-time faculty is 12 credit hours per semester. Adjustments to that load may be made with the recommendation of the chair and approval of the dean.
216.07 Faculty Workload Faculty teaching load and workload assignments are made by the unit head, with the approval of the dean.

The standard teaching load for regular full-time faculty is 12 credit hours per semester, within the standard workload of 15 hours per semester. The difference reflects the non-teaching duties of the faculty member in the areas of scholarship and service. It is expected that full-time regular faculty will contribute in the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service each academic year. Adjustments to the standard workload distribution may be made through consultation with the faculty member, recommendation of the unit head, and approval of the dean. It is incumbent upon every faculty member to demonstrate performance consistent with his/her particular workload distribution. Overload assignments agreed to by faculty shall be made according to Section 216.08 of this handbook. Twelve-month appointments are standard for full-time library faculty. Professional responsibilities for full-time library faculty include librarianship/teaching, scholarship, and service. Library unit heads and the dean establish workload assignments for library faculty during an annual planning meeting held with each faculty member. The standard teaching load for full-time temporary faculty is 15 credit hours per semester. Full-time temporary faculty may have opportunities to make non-teaching contributions in support of the University's mission.

However, in the absence of non-teaching assignments, or in cases when those assignments total fewer than 3 hours, the unit head, with approval of the dean, shall adjust the teaching load such that a 15-hour total workload is maintained. Part-time

faculty assignments shall be limited to teaching, unless otherwise approved by the dean.

The Provost must approve exceptions to this policy.

Motion by Jean Paul Carton (CLASS), “Proposed Faculty Workload Statement for the Faculty Handbook”: Jean-Paul Carton, on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee, moved that the second paragraph of Section 216.07 of the Faculty Handbook be deleted and that the first paragraph be kept as is. The motion was seconded and Jeanette Rice Jenkins called for discussion.

Laura Regassa (COST) remarked that the term “credit hours” that appears in the first paragraph is problematic in the biology department because they can teach a four credit hour class with labs which is actually eight contact hours. Regassa offered a friendly amendment to the Carton motion that “credit hours” be changed to “contact hours” in the first paragraph.

Carton accepted this amendment but commented that he was now speaking on his own behalf and not on behalf of the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Robert Cook (CIT) stated that he was a member of the Faculty Welfare Committee and was against modifying the motion.

Rice Jenkins interpreted that to mean that the friendly amendment was not accepted by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Debra Sabia (CLASS) asked about the history of the proposed policy change. Carton replied that the motion was brought forward in response to a proposal for a new faculty workload statement for the Faculty Handbook and submitted to the Faculty Welfare Committee last spring by former Provost Vandegrift. Carton went on to say that this faculty workload statement appears as an attachment to the motion.

Robert Cook (CIT) noted that the Faculty Welfare Committee had been and continues to be deluged with policy revisions to the Faculty Handbook. Cook stated that his opinion on the matter was that, unless someone presented the committee a specific problem that needed to be solved and suggested rewording to address the problem, he was reluctant to revise the Handbook. He said that the committee considered many variations of “contact hour” and it got so complicated that doing nothing seemed the best solution. This seemed especially true given that the university seems to operate

fine even the way the Handbook reads now and that this was the basis for his objection to modifying the motion. Debra Sabia queried whether the Faculty Welfare Committee shaped the motion intentionally to leave the first paragraph of Section 216.07 of the Faculty Handbook intact and to strike the second paragraph. Rice Jenkins confirmed this.

Mark Welford (COST) commented that other language in the paragraph referred to a “15- hour total workload” and that this related to the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Report where they want to develop such a thing as the concept of a “workload” hour.

He then moved, therefore, that the whole motion be sent back to committee for reevaluation.

The motion was seconded and Rice Jenkins asked for discussion on the question of whether to commit the motion back to committee for the purpose of discussing the implications of the “15-hour teaching load.”

Jean-Paul Carton commented that, if the motion were sent back to the Welfare Committee, the committee would need to know the scope of the revisions the Senate wants. If that was not clarified, he was not in favor of having the motion sent back.

Candy Schille (CLASS) noted that the Faculty Roles and Rewards Task Force Final Report would be discussed later in the meeting and that the workload discussion should be postponed until after that discussion had occurred. Consequently, she supported not sending the motion back to committee.

Richard Flynn (CLASS) commented that the only effect of the current motion was to remove archaic language from the Faculty Handbook and thus should not be sent back to committee.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins, asking for and hearing no further discussion on the question of whether to send the motion back to committee, called for a vote on this issue. The vote on the Welford motion to send the Carton motion back to committee was taken by voice and failed. Debate on the original Carton motion therefore continued.

Mark Edwards (COST) suggested that the motion could be amended to read only that the second paragraph be removed from the Handbook with no mention of retaining the

first paragraph. Rice Jenkins asked whether Edwards wished to offer a friendly amendment and he said yes.

Jean-Paul Carton did not accept this friendly amendment and Edwards withdrew his motion to amend.

Jeanette Rice Jenkins asked for further discussion on the original Carton motion. Hearing none, she called for the vote.

The Carton motion, i.e., to leave the first paragraph of Section 216.07 of the Faculty Handbook intact and strike the second paragraph, passed by voice vote.